



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/608,267	06/27/2003	Brian Jones	60001.0244US01/MS300530.1	8319
27488	7590	09/27/2007	EXAMINER	
MERCHANT & GOULD (MICROSOFT) P.O. BOX 2903 MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402-0903			PAULA, CESAR B	
		ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER
		2178		
		MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
		09/27/2007	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/608,267	JONES ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	CESAR B. PAULA	2178

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 23 July 2007.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 2-5,7-19 and 21-24 is/are pending in the application.
 - 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 2-5,7-19 and 21-24 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 - a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date See Continuation Sheet
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to the amendment, and IDSs filed on 10/30, 10/02, 10/26, 10/30, 11/20, and 12/26/2006 respectively.

This action is made Final.

2. In the amendment, claim 24 has been added. Claims 2-5, 7-19, and 21-24 are pending in the case. Claims 3, 11, and 21 are independent claims.

3. The rejections of claims 2-5, 7-19, and 21-23 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being anticipated by Huynh et al, hereinafter Huynh, (USPub # 2002/0198909, 12/26/2002), have been withdrawn as necessitated by the amendment.

Drawings

4. The drawings filed on 6/27/2003 have been accepted by the Examiner.

Claim Objections

5. The numbering of claims is not in accordance with 37 CFR 1.126 which requires the original numbering of the claims to be preserved throughout the prosecution. When claims are canceled, the remaining claims must not be renumbered. When new claims are presented, they must be numbered consecutively beginning with the number next following the highest numbered claims previously presented (whether entered or not).

Misnumbered claim 20 (previously canceled) been renumbered as claim 24.

Specification

6. The objection to the abstract of the disclosure has been withdrawn as necessitated by the amendment.

Information Disclosure Statement

7. The information disclosure statements filed on 2/12, 2/16, 3/12, and 4/30/2007 respectively have been considered, except for some US applications, which have not been entered due to their confidentiality. However, IDSs filed on, 6/22 and 7/30/2007 have not been considered, because the listed prior art entries are illegible.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

8. The rejections of claims 2-10, and 21-23 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 have been withdrawn as necessitated by the amendment.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

9. The rejections of claims 2-10 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement have been withdrawn as necessitated by the amendment.

10. The rejections of claims 2-10 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention, have been withdrawn as necessitated by the amendment.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

11. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

12. Claims 2-5, 7-19, and 21-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Huynh et al, hereinafter Huynh, (USPub # 2002/0198909, 12/26/2002).

Regarding independent claim 3, Hyunh discloses an application program module for creating a document, and communicating with action DLLs connected to the program, which determine what actions, associated with a markup language document text strings, to present to a user in relation to the markup language of the data strings. A recognizer DLL sends semantic categories including labels to the program module (0036, 0039-0042, 0044, 104-106).

Additionally, Hyunh discloses the storage of semantic categories containing a namespace in a document (0039, 0104-0107). *--receiving a text string annotated with markup language data in an action dynamic link library (DLL); transmitting the text string and the markup language data associated with the at least one annotated and the at least one unannotated portions to a plurality of action plug-ins; determining, in the action plug-ins, one or more*

actions based on the associated markup language data; passing the one or more actions to an application program module for displaying the one or more actions in association with the text string; displaying the one or more actions in association with the text string; wherein for any portion of the text string not annotated with markup language data the method further comprises: receiving the text string in a recognizer dynamically linked library (DLL); receiving markup language data associated with the text string in the recognizer dynamically linked library; parsing the associated markup language data to assist the recognizer DLL to determine one or more labels for the text string; and transmitting the one or more labels and the associated markup language data to the application program module for passing to the action DLL. Huynh fails to explicitly teach *parsing markup language data associated with the at least one annotated portion to assist the recognizer DLL to determine one or more labels for the at least one unannotated portion of the text string.* It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to determine the label for the unannotated text using the annotated text, because of all the reasons found in Huynh, including using other parts of the document text to determine the semantic label of an element, such as an address (185). This would have provided the benefit of quickly, and effectively ascertaining the identity of a text string associated with previously identified related string.

Regarding claim 2, which depends on claim 3, Hyunh discloses action DLLs connected to the program, which determine what actions, associated with a markup language document text strings, to present to a user in relation to the markup language of the data strings. A recognizer

DLL sends semantic categories including labels to the program module (0036, 0039-0042, 0044, 104-106).

Regarding claim 4, which depends on claim 3, Hyunh discloses recognizer plugins pass the labeling results, for every string in the entire document, to the recognizer DLL, which in turn passes the obtained results to the program (0039-0042, 0044, 104-107).

Regarding claim 5, which depends on claim 3, Hyunh discloses comparing the strings and the markup for matching labels. If a match is found labeling the string with the associated label (0039-0042, 0044, 104-107).

Regarding claim 7, which depends on claim 3, Hyunh discloses adding labels to the document (0042-0044).

Regarding claim 8, which depends on claim 7, Hyunh discloses adding labels to the document, once the label has been obtained (0042-0044).

Regarding claim 9, which depends on claim 3, Hyunh discloses adding labels to the document, using metadata (0042-0044).

Regarding claim 10, which depends on claim 3, Hyunh discloses adding labels to an XML document, once the label has been obtained (0042-0044, 0105-0106).

Regarding independent claim 11, Hyunh discloses an application program module for creating a document, and communicating with action DLLs connected to the program, which determine what actions, associated with a markup language document text strings, to present to a user in relation to the markup language of the data strings. A recognizer DLL sends semantic categories including labels to the program module. Metadata is used for those cases where information found in a string is not sufficient (0036, 0039-0042, 0044, 0064, 0070-0071, 104-106) -- *as a string of text having an associated one or more Extensible Markup Language (XML) elements is entered into the electronic document, determining whether the string of text matches one of a plurality of stored strings; if so, then designating a label associated with the matched stored string for application to the entered string of text; if the string of text does not match one of a plurality of stored strings, determining whether the one or more XML elements associated with the string of text is associated with a label for use with the entered string of text; and if so, then designating a label associated with the one or more XML elements for application to the entered string of text.* Huynh fails to explicitly teach *utilizing at least one label associated with another string in the electronic document.* It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to determine the label for the unannotated text using the annotated text, because of all the reasons found in Huynh, including using other parts of the document text to determine the semantic label of an element, such as an address (185). This would have provided the benefit of quickly, and effectively ascertaining the identity of a text string associated with a previously identified related string.

Regarding claim 12, which depends on claim 11, Hyunh discloses adding actions associated with labels of the document text string or markup (0042-0044, 0104-016).

Regarding claim 13, which depends on claim 12, Hyunh discloses adding labels to the document using semantic categories containing a namespace in a document (0039, 0042-0044, 0104-0107).

Regarding claim 14, which depends on claim 11, Hyunh discloses adding actions associated with labels of the document text string or markup (0042-0044, 0104-016).

Regarding claim 15, which depends on claim 13, Hyunh discloses adding actions associated with labels of the document text string or markup (0042-0044, 0104-016).

Regarding claim 16, which depends on claim 15, Hyunh discloses adding actions associated with labels of the document text string or markup. A user is allowed to select and perform the actions (0042-0044, 0104-016).

Claim 17 is directed to a computer readable medium equivalent to the steps of claim 11, and therefore is similarly rejected.

Regarding claim 18, which depends on claim 16, Hyunh discloses an action DLL determining and passing action to be performed to appropriate action plugins (0040-0044).

Regarding claim 19, which depends on claim 11, Hyunh discloses using a URL if there is no action plugin associated with the label (0042-0044).

Regarding independent claim 21, Hyunh discloses an application program module for creating a document. An action DLL connected to the program determines what actions, associated with a markup language document, to present to a user. A recognizer DLL sends semantic categories including labels to the program module (0036, 0039-0040, 0044, 104-106).

Additionally, Hyunh discloses the storage of semantic categories containing a namespace in a document (0039, 0104000000-0107).

Regarding claim 22, which depends on claim 21, Hyunh discloses an application program module for creating a document, and communicating with action DLLs connected to the program, which determine what actions, associated with a markup language document text strings entered by a user, to present to a user in relation to the markup language of the data strings. A recognizer DLL sends semantic categories including labels to the program module (0036, 0039-0042, 0044, 104-107).

Claim 23 is directed to a system for performing the steps of claim 4, and therefore is similarly rejected.

Regarding claim 24, which depends on claim 17, Hyunh discloses an application program module for creating a document, and communicating with action DLLs connected to the program, which determine what actions, associated with a markup language document text strings, to present to a user in relation to the markup language of the data strings. A recognizer DLL sends semantic categories including labels to the program module. Metadata is used for those cases where information found in a string is not sufficient (0036, 0039-0042, 0044, 0064, 0070-0071, 104-106). Huynh fails to explicitly teach *the label associated with the string of text is an "address" label and the label associated with the other string of text is a "ZIP code" label*. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to determine the label for the unannotated text using the annotated text, because of all the reasons found in Huynh, including using other parts of the document text to determine the semantic label of an element, such as an address (185). This would have provided the benefit of quickly, and effectively ascertaining the identity of a text string associated with part of a previously identified related string.

Response to Arguments

13. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection. The Applicants are directed towards the new grounds of rejection above in light of the newly found prior art.

Conclusion

14. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

I. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Cesar B. Paula whose telephone number is (571) 272-4128. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 8:00 a.m. to 4:00 p.m. (EST).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Stephen Hong, can be reached on (571) 272-4124. However, in such a case, please allow at least one business day.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, go to <http://portal.uspto.gov/external/portal/pair>. Should you have any questions about access to the Private PAIR system, please contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866 217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service

Art Unit: 2178

Representative or access to the automated information system, please call 800-786-9199 or 571
272-1000 (USA or Canada).

Any response to this Action should be mailed to:

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Or faxed to:

- **(571)-273-8300** (for all Formal communications intended for entry)



CESAR PAULA
PRIMARY EXAMINER
9/25/2007

Continuation of Attachment(s) 3). Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08), Paper No(s)/Mail Date
2/12,2/16,3/12,4/30,6/22,7/30/07.